



**Trinity Utilities Committee  
Tuesday, March 07, 2006  
7:00 P.M.**

**The Utilities Committee held its regularly scheduled meeting on Tuesday, March 07, 2006 at 7:00 pm at Trinity City Hall for the purpose of discussion, review and action for items listed on their Agenda.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chairman, Lloyd Brown; Committee Members, Mickey Callahan, Bobby Campbell, Jay Morrow, Mike Robertson, and Tommy Johnson.

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Kelly Grooms

**COUNCIL LIAISONS PRESENT:** Barry Lambeth.

**OTHERS PRESENT:** City Manager, Ann Bailie; City Clerk, Debbie Hinson; City Planning/Zoning and Code Enforcement Administrator, Adam Stumb; City Engineer, Randy McNeill, Davis-Martin-Powell and Associates, and Lynn Patterson, Duke Power Engineering Associate.

**ITEM 1. Welcome**

Chairman Brown called the March 07, 2006 Utilities Committee Meeting to order at 7:00 pm and welcomed everyone in attendance.

**ITEM 2. Review and Approve Minutes of December 6, 2005 Utilities Committee Meeting**

Chairman Brown called for any corrections, deletions, or additions to the December 06, 2005 minutes. Hearing none, Chairman Brown called for a motion to approve the minutes.

*Committee Member Robertson made a motion to approve the December 06, 2005 minutes of the Utilities Committee as written. Committee Member Johnson seconded the motion. The motion and second were approved unanimously by all Committee Members present.*

**ITEM 3. Review and Approve Minutes of February 7, 2006 Utilities Committee Meeting**

Chairman Brown called for any corrections, deletions, or additions to the February 07, 2006 minutes. Hearing none, Chairman Brown called for a motion to approve the minutes.

*Committee Member Callahan made a motion to approve the February 07, 2006 minutes of the Utilities Committee as written. Committee Member Campbell seconded the motion. The motion and second were approved unanimously by all Committee Members present.*

**Unfinished Business**

**ITEM 4. Street Paving Guidelines (tabled from Feb. 7 meeting)/Recommendation to Council**

Chairman Brown opened this item for continued discussion from an earlier meeting.

Manager Bailie advised members that member Grooms would not be able to attend the meeting tonight, however we have talked since our last meeting and he has asked me to advise you that he was in favor of the Guidelines as they were written and included in your Agenda packet.

Manager Bailie advised members that she had taken comments from last months meeting and incorporated them into the Draft Guidelines. This is what member Grooms looked at and was agreeable to them. The draft allows Option 2 as well as the provided guidelines for Option 3.

Chairman Brown reviewed the revisions as follows:

- **The percentage of property owners needed was 66% of the property owners to agree or a 2/3rds majority**
- **If the property owners care to bring the road to standards as in Option 2 and the Council agrees the City will assume maintenance.**
- **If we do not get a response from property owners in a petition they will be counted as a yes vote for the petition.**
- **The City would not participate in agreements among the neighbors. It is up to the neighbors to resolve this among themselves.**

Member Callahan asked if a community or neighborhood currently had a road that was being maintained by the State and the street or road was already at State Standards, under Option 2 they would not pay anything. Manager Bailie advised members that the Council would have to approve taking over the road for maintenance. It would be their decision to assume maintenance responsibility for the street or deny the request.

Council liaison Lambeth advised members that he did not feel the Council would assume a road that was currently maintained by the State until they felt they should. The residents could come forward with a petition but NCDOT will take care of their road unless the City accepts responsibility.

Manager Bailie advised members that the general response from staff to citizens that call to report pot holes is first to inform them these roads do not belong to the City and we either call NCDOT or give them the number to contact NCDOT. The only time the City would consider taking over a State Road would be if they had just been paved. This Draft is to address private roads. These are roads that no one is assuming maintenance of except the property owners.

Members discussed the options available under this draft and asked under these Guidelines did Council have the option to decide which Option they would consider to assume maintenance of the road or do the property owners make the decisions on what option they would like to elect. Manager Bailie advised members it was her interpretation that the property owners make the first move. They can bring a petition to the City whereby Option 3 begins implementation or they could come and address Council advising them they had brought the road up to State Standards and would like for the City to consider assuming maintenance for this road. This is something we would have to work on with the property owners.

Members asked if curb and gutter would be required by the State. Mr. McNeill advised members that NCDOT could not set stipulations if the City assumed maintenance of a road. It would be the decision of the City whether to install curb and gutter. The City is requiring Curb and Gutter in all new developments but are not requiring sidewalks at this time. Mr. McNeill discussed the earlier question concerning assumption of private roads and State Standards. If the street is private and paved it must meet State Standards for a paved State Road including street width. It would not meet State Standards if it had failing asphalt or was full of potholes.

Chairman Brown reviewed the Draft Guidelines included in the packet and listed below.

1. Comments: The City Council will consider and approve projects and will be the only way a project can move forward.
2. Mr. McNeill advised members this item addressed what was currently being done on some of the roads in the Darr Road Project. There are 4 non surfaced streets that do not have gravel. They are passable when it is dry but not when they are wet. When sewer infrastructure is installed up the middle of these roads they will be impassable. We will put a good stone road on them when the infrastructure is installed. This expense will be paid for within the Grant Project.
3. A- This states this applies to gravel roads. Any paved road is either owned by the State or City or not covered in this option.

- B- (1) This was included in last month's packet and detailed the rules and procedures for levying assessments.
- (2) If you are a corner lot only one (1) longest side can be assessed. The owner does not pay twice.

Added Language from discussion of items 4 and 5: **the property owner be assessed only for the longer side that was greater than the prior assessment length.**

- (3) There was discussion among members concerning the need to incorporate language so that a owner could not be assessed two (2) times. Mr. McNeill advised members that number (2) addressed this issue. Further discussion concerning how number 2 would address this scenario if the longest side is assessed one year and the street in front of the house is done another year. After discussion concerning this item, Member Johnson suggested adding language that the property owner be assessed only for the longer side that was greater than the prior assessment length. This would mean that if you had already been assessed for 300 feet and the new assessment was for 1,000 feet the owner would be assessed for 700 feet the difference of (1,000 ft - 300 ft.). **\*\* See Item 2\*\***
- (4) **The added language that the property owner be assessed only for the longer side that was greater than the prior assessment length to Item 2.**
- (5) A No Response is counted as a Yes.

There was discussion concerning persons speaking at the Public Hearing and if this was addressing any individual that spoke for the project or property owners only. Manager Bailie stated the calculations would be based on property owners that spoke. Members asked if the calculations were based on one (1) property owner per home. Manager Bailie advised members it was based on who ever was on the deed. If there are 2 persons on the deed then there would be 2 votes. For speaking at the public hearing I would say if one (1) of the two (2) property owners on the deed speaks it would take care of both persons listed on the deed. After discussion, Manager Bailie suggested adding language to this section that stated **at the Public Hearing if one (1) person speaks they would represent the total number of property owners for that particular piece of property and it would not be necessary for both property owners to speak at the Public Hearing.**

- (6) The extent to which the City and property owners would consider the possibility of redesigning a road to be able to still accommodate property owners petitioning the City for road improvements. Manager Bailie stated this would be based on the judgment of city staff and a recommendation to the Council that included all of the costs. Council would make this decision. **After further discussion members asked that the wording be changed from shall not go forward to "may not go forward."**
- (7) Provisions apply to both commercial property owners and residential property owners.
- (8) The City will not take part in contractual arrangements between residents.

After the review Manager Bailie discussed with members why this came to the board from Council. These represent Guidelines for the Council to follow if they choose to do so. They will need to judge each case as it comes before them. Manager Bailie and members reviewed how the votes would be calculated for the Cold Brook Court petition. At the Public Hearing there was one (1) person in this area that had not signed the petition and came and spoke at the Public Hearing in favor of the project. This became a yes vote for the purpose of meeting the 66%. The 2 property owners that did not respond will count as a yes vote only as a part of the 66% requirement. This will give this area more than the 66% required.

***Member Campbell made a motion to accept the draft with the discussed changes tonight, seconded by Member Callahan, and approved unanimously by all Committee members present.***

## New Business

### **ITEM 5. Street Lighting Update (Lynn Patterson, Duke Power Engineering Associate)**

Chairman Brown opened this item, and welcomed Lynn Patterson, Duke Power Engineering Associate.

Ms. Patterson updated members on the progress of the Street Lighting Projects. She advised members that all engineering work was completed on the Fairview Church Road Project and is ready to be forwarded to NCDOT. It will probably remain with NCDOT 3 to 4 weeks. Once they approve the project we can begin work. I will forward contracts to Manager Bailie at that time. We are beginning engineering work on the Ronniedale Project next week. There have been some holdups with mapping and several other things. She discussed with members the importance of advising her if and when the City took over street maintenance. If the City owns the street then the projects do not have to be forwarded to NCDOT for approval. We can still light the street to NCDOT Standards but the scale drawings and these types of things take much longer than if the street belonged to the City.

Ms. Patterson and members discussed the proposed lighting for intersections and curves on Turnpike Court. Ms. Patterson advised members that they were usually allowed to do intersections, however when intersections are lighted NCDOT requires lighting 3 poles out in all directions. This is their set standards and need to be met to get a project approved. Intersection lighting can be done but the lighting will need to be extended both ways. Members and Ms. Patterson discussed the lighting standards on Hopewell Church and Finch Farm. Ms. Patterson advised members that the lighting at these two (2) locations were set to NCDOT Standards. The lighting would be better if it were located on both sides of the road. There was further discussion concerning possible ways to provide power to allow lighting on both sides of these roads.

Chairman Brown discussed earlier conversation from Committee members concerning the length of the arms and if there were options to change the length that might extend lighting further over the road. Ms. Patterson advised members that her company no longer did lighting with 20 foot arms. They were an option at one point. You can use up to 12 foot arms. NCDOT normally likes poles to be set back 12 to 15 feet because of their right of way. Our lighting arm is encroaching on their right of way and that is why we need to get an encroachment agreement from NCDOT. We must always set our poles behind the ditch line on a NCDOT Road.

Mr. McNeill discussed the need for the City and Ms. Patterson to work together to coordinate the lighting on Hopewell since sewer infrastructure was being installed in this area. Ms. Patterson and Mr. McNeill discussed mapping needed for this area. Ms. Patterson advised Mr. McNeill any mapping he could provide to her company would help since NCDOT preferred scaled drawing. Our maps are not truly scaled drawings. This is one of the issues concerning my company providing Interstate Lighting as requested earlier and why we do not install Interstate Lighting. The other issue is to acquire a work zone designation that allows a company to do work on the Interstate. We do not have that designation and therefore are not allowed to work on the Interstate. The cube lighting that you see along the Interstate has been installed by NCDOT.

There was further discussion concerning the amount of time that would be needed to complete the Fairview Church Road Project. Ms. Patterson advised members that once the work is started she felt the project would be completed in approximately four (4) weeks if crews do not have to be pulled from this job due and moved to other job locations that could occur such as storm damage. This would effect the time line for this project.

After discussion with Ms. Patterson, members discussed the need to address comments concerning the lighting of the opposite sides of Finch Farm and Hopewell Church Road.

***After a brief discussion, Member Callahan made a motion to forward to Council the proposal to install street lighting on the other side of Finch Farm and Hopewell Church Road, seconded by Member Johnson and approved unanimously by all members present.***

Members discussed the need to identify future lighting projects. Chairman Brown advised members that he was presented with a letter from the Friends of Trinity requesting that the Utilities Committee consider the installation of street lights on Meadowbrook Road beginning at NC Highway 62 and somewhat beyond the

Interstate 85 overpass. Lighting along the Meadowbrook Road corridor would definitely enhance the City of Trinity and project a continuation of the main Thoroughfare lighting already in place.

Chairman Brown called for discussion or other recommendations from members for future lighting projects and reviewed the Committee's earlier motion for proposed lighting on Finch Farm and Hopewell Church Roads. Member Callahan suggested Turnpike and discussed the dark areas located along this road.

Chairman Brown opened the floor for motion by members for recommendations of the next phase of street lighting.

Members discussed the request from Friends of Trinity for Meadowbrook Road and whether to light the entire road or a portion. Chairman Brown discussed Ms. Patterson's earlier statement concerning her feelings not to spotlight the City and jump from project to project doing a small amount at each project. If this area is recommended I would recommend that the entire road be lighted. Members discussed Ronniedale Road and the fact that it intersected with Fairview Church Road as well as Meadowbrook Road. Mr. McNeill advised members that the water line being installed by Davidson Water will be the entire length of Meadowbrook Road to the intersection of Kennedy Road. This would also allow Ms. Patterson to acquire a good map from Davidson Water for this road. There was discussion between Mr. McNeill and members concerning the need to time the project if recommended to coincide with completion of work by Davidson Water to avoid problems.

After further discussion concerning the proposed projects, Chairman Brown opened the floor to motions for proposed lighting projects.

***Member Johnson made a motion that the Utilities Committee recommend to the City Council for Meadowbrook and Turnpike to be the next lighting projects undertaken by the City. The motion was seconded by Member Robertson and approved unanimously by all Committee Members present.***

***After discussion between Manager Bailie and members concerning clarification of the motion concerning the areas recommended, Chairman Brown called for a vote to prioritize the projects recommended. By vote the Utilities Committee voted to prioritize the lighting projects in the following order:***

- 1<sup>st</sup>: Opposite Sides of Interchanges (Finch Farm and Hopewell Church)***
- 2<sup>nd</sup>: Meadowbrook (Entire Length)***
- 3<sup>rd</sup>: Turnpike (Entire Length)***

***After prioritization of the projects, the Utilities Committee recommended by consensus that the entire length of Meadowbrook Road and Turnpike be lighted.***

Prior to moving to the next item, Manager Bailie and members discussed the lighting policy previously recommended by Council prior to recommendations for future lighting projects. Mr. McNeill also advised members that a map could be prepared that illustrated the areas that had been lighted and would help the committee in future recommendations to spread the lighting across the city in a fair and equitable manner.

#### **ITEM 6. DOT Traffic Flow and Road Markings (Rob Stone, NCDOT Division Traffic Engineer (Tentative))**

After Chairman Brown opened this item, Manager Bailie advised members that Mr. Stone could not make this meeting but could come next month. I could talk with him before the meeting next month and bring him up to date on the issues surrounding this item.

Manager Bailie advised members that she had reviewed some prior meeting minutes and found additional items that had been discussed in addition to the items specified. These include improving the ramps at Finch Farm possibly in light of the Unilin Development, as well as the location of the stop sign at the cut through at NC Highway 62 and Turnpike. Members discussed the stop sign issue with Manager Bailie. They discussed the current location of this sign and the fact that it currently sits back behind the actual intersection. If the sign is moved it will be sitting in the middle of the business parking lot located at this intersection. There was also discussing between Manager Bailie and members concerning issues in regards to the location and lack of Interstate 85 signage as well as the current system in place throughout the state. Chairman Brown discussed the reasoning explained to him in regards to this. The signage is placed this way for visitors in an effort to offer

alternate routes. After further discussion, Manager Bailie and members felt this would be a good issue to address with Mr. Stone. The last item discussed was Braxton Craven School and the congestion that occurs.

After a brief discussion, Manager Bailie advised members that she would contact Mr. Stone in the interim prior to the next meeting in regards to these issues so that he will be able to address these issues.

There was further discussion concerning possible ways to address traffic congestion at this location. One item discussed was the possibility to load and unload students at the back of the school.

#### **Additional Business**

##### **ITEM 7. Business From Committee Members**

None

##### **ITEM 8. Business From City Manager**

Manager Bailie asked Mr. McNeill to review the monthly sewer handout with Utilities Members. Mr. McNeill reviewed the handout dated February 17, 2006 (below).

Mr. McNeill advised members that a bid date to open bids for the Darr Road Project had been set for Thursday, April 13, 2006. The Council will consider awarding the bid the following Tuesday night. Our plans are finished and 99% of the easements have been acquired for this project.

**City of Trinity**  
**Davis-Martin-Powell and Associates**  
**Monthly Projects Progress Report**  
**February 17, 2006**

**Phase 1 – Sewer Extensions**

- Phase 1 extensions along Finch Farm Road, County Meadows Lane, Dawn Acres Lane, and Shadydale Acres Lane
  - Design complete, easements acquired
  - Construction near completion on Finch Farm Road and Country Meadows Lane
- Phase 1 pump station site and meter site improvements
  - Design complete, easements acquired
  - Construction Contract awarded
  - No construction work to date

**Colonial Heights Area**

- Outfall from pump station to Colonial Circle installed
- Colonial Circle sewer installed from Highway 62 along eastern entrance to southwestern portion of roadway
- Forcemain installation completed except for testing
- Pump station wetwell, retaining wall and building installed
- Outfall pipeline construction continues near Regina Street

**Phase 2 Sewer Extension**

- Construction plan/profile drawing for pipeline route are complete
- Erosion control details currently being added to plans
- Easement surveying complete and strip maps are being finalized
- Preparation of legal descriptions are 90% complete
- 60 legal descriptions have been sent to Attorney and R/W Agent

**Darr Road Area**

- Plans completed, permits have been submitted to agencies
- Erosion control plans approved, DENR will review site next week
- Most easements have been acquired by R/W Agent

**Phase 3 Sewer Extension**

- Detailed pipeline routing exhibits prepared for all areas
- Initial route surveying in Lakewood area completed
- Plan/profile drawings being developed for Lakewood area
- Routing surveys underway in Highway 62, Hopewell, Jerry Street area
- Forcemain back to Phase 2 along Interstate being surveyed

**City of Trinity  
Sewer System Improvements  
Preliminary Completion Schedules – February 2006**

**Phase 1 Extension**

|                       |           |
|-----------------------|-----------|
| Complete Construction | May, 2006 |
|-----------------------|-----------|

**Colonial Heights**

|                       |           |
|-----------------------|-----------|
| Complete Construction | May, 2006 |
|-----------------------|-----------|

**Darr Road Area**

|                                     |               |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| Complete design & submit permits    | January, 2006 |
| Receive permits & acquire easements | March, 2006   |
| Open Bids                           | April, 2006   |
| Complete Construction               | January, 2007 |

**Phase 2 Project**

|                                     |                |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|
| Complete design & submit permits    | February, 2006 |
| Receive permits & acquire easements | May, 2006      |
| Open Bids                           | May, 2006      |
| Complete Construction               | May, 2007      |

**Phase 3 Project**

|                       |                |
|-----------------------|----------------|
| Begin Design          | December, 2005 |
| Complete Construction | December, 2008 |

**Phase 4 Project**

|                       |            |
|-----------------------|------------|
| Begin Design          | Fall, 2007 |
| Complete Construction | Fall, 2010 |

**Phase 5 Project**

|                       |            |
|-----------------------|------------|
| Begin Design          | Fall, 2008 |
| Complete Construction | Fall, 2011 |

There was a brief discussion concerning an article from the City of Archdale Annual Retreat concerning the possibility of a joint venture with the City of Trinity and Randolph County for a sewer treatment plant. This discussion will now take on a more serious nature since we have been able to acquire a long-term commitment with the City of Thomasville.

There was a brief discussion concerning the proposed projects and proposed annexation. Council member liaison Lambeth advised members that discussion only concerning these projects had taken place at this time. He discussed Council's feeling not to take funds already committed to another project to be expended on a different project. Mr. McNeill advised members the 2 projects consisted of the High School site with the surrounding farm land as well as a proposed 200 to 300 acre tract of vacant property.



Mr. McNeill discussed with members the City's need for new customers. The way we made our calculations for financing the areas proposed in the bond referendum was to have all the residents currently located in these areas as customers in addition to 1,500 new customers (new development) in the time frame that Phase 5 is being done. We have moved up in the time schedule in years but have not increased our customer base very much. Most of the new customers have resulted from growth within the City (vacant lots that would not perk but can now be used since sewer is available). Mr. McNeill stated he felt the customer base would increase as the City grew. The rate of growth will determine where we will go in the later phases. If we have to continue to use sales tax revenue to pay debt it will slow the City down in growth in other areas. If we begin to increase our customer base and increase revenues we will be able to move forward because the City will not have to dedicate as much sales tax revenue to meet the debt obligation.

There was discussion concerning the number of customers currently being billed for sewer service. Manager Bailie advised members there were approximately 150 customers at this time. Mr. McNeill stated this was approximately 1/2 of the residents that have sewer available at their residence. Manager Bailie discussed with members the time limits for hook ups. Residents in the original Phase 1 project (approximately 35 homes) are either hooked into the system or they are being billed. Phase 1 extension will be required to tie into the system by October 06.

**ITEM 9.           Adjournment**

With no other business to discuss, Chairman Brown called for a motion to adjourn the March 7, 2006 Regular Meeting of the Trinity Utilities Committee.

***Motion to adjourn the March 07, 2006 Regular Meeting of the Trinity Utilities Committee by Member Robertson, seconded by member Morrow and approved unanimously by all Committee members present.***

***These minutes were approved by the Utilities Committee as written at their Regular Meeting held on May 02, 2006 upon motion by Committee Member Johnson, seconded by Committee Member Morrow and approved unanimously by all Committee Members present.***